

Approved 8/6/99

Minutes of the Advisory Council on Clean Air Compliance Analysis (The Council) Teleconference

June 22, 1999

The Advisory Council on Clean Air Compliance Analysis (The Council) met in teleconference on June 22, 1999 to review drafts reports produced by its Air Quality Models (AQMS) and Health and Environmental Effects (HEES) Subcommittees. The meeting was announced in the Federal Register at FR Vol. 64, No. 109, pp.30516-30517, June 8, 1999 (Volume 64, Number 109)1999 (Attachment A). The agenda for the meeting is provided in Attachment B.

Dr. Maureen Cropper, Council Chair, convened the teleconference at 1pm. The following Members and Consultants participated: Drs. A. Myrick Freeman, Don Fullerton, Lawrence H. Goulder, Jane V. Hall, Lester B. Lave, Paul Lioy, Paulette Middleton, Alan J. Krupnick, and William H. Smith .

The following SAB Staff and members of the public were "on line" for the teleconference:

Ms. Kristin Brown (Ford Motor Co), Ms. Pamela Najor - Bureau of National Affairs, Daily Environment Report, Ms. Rachel Urdan - Inside Washington, Mr. Jonathan Gladhill- EOP Group, Ms. Pat Phibbs- Environmental Health Letter, Mr. Tom Ellis -EPA/ OAQPS, Ms. Lisa Conner- EPA/OAQPS, Dr. Jim DeMocker- EPA/OAQPS, Mr. Samuel Rondberg-EPA/SAB, and Dr. Donald Barnes- EPA/SAB.

The Council then turned to discussion of the draft AQMS report on modeling and emissions. Dr. Middleton presented the report and summarized its findings. Drs. Krupnick and Hall, serving as the principle reviewers, recommended that the report be approved, with the following modifications:

1. One of the main points of the Advisory is that motor vehicles produce a greater percent of PM_{2.5} using observed data than they do based on the emissions inventory. Thus, their contribution to PM_{2.5} is understated in the Prospective Study. The Council felt that it was important to clarify the reasoning underlying this statement. If "observed data" refers to ambient PM concentrations, then the disparity between observed data and model results could be due either to (a) an inaccurate emissions inventory or (b) faulty modeling. The Council also felt it important to point out any biases in estimates of costs and benefits that might result from inadequate representation of mobile sources in the PM inventory.
2. If any biases exist because the emissions inventory fails to reflect downward trend in ambient PM concentrations these should also be stated.
3. The first paragraph on the top of p. 7 requires clarification.

4. The recommended approach to interpolation/substitution of missing data needs to be clarified.
5. It would be helpful to explain what a *modeling platform* is.
6. It would help to explain that "crustal" means road dust.

The Council then addressed the HEES draft report on initial assessment of health and ecological effects. Dr. Liroy introduced the report, followed by comments from Drs. Lave and Freeman, who had been designated as the lead reviewers of this report. Dr. Freeman noted that he had participated in the writing of the HEES report, and therefore would not comment as a reviewer. Dr. Lave commented that he generally approved of the report, but raised several issues that he felt required modification of the draft. Drs. Gouldner and Krupnick participated in the discussion, as did EPA/OAQPS staff members DeMocker and Conner. The Council decided to approve the report, subject to the following edits and revisions:

- a) the report should be revised (pages two and three) to make the "message" clearer and to provide better transitions between the second and third paragraphs of page two. The discussion should include a comment on the fact that considerable amounts of lead are still being emitted into the atmosphere.
- b) the report should include a better discussion of the meta-analysis of the ozone-related mortality studies. Dr. Lave agreed to provide written input to facilitate this revision
- c) comments on the ASPEN model should address the issue of the model's ability (or inability) to provide estimates of outdoor carbon monoxide (CO) exposure for the large population segments
- d) comments on the Pope study (page 14) should be extended to state whether or not the re-analysis would be incorporated in the prospective study
- e) the appendix should include mention of the Adirondack study on nitrogen saturation (Dr. Krupnick will provide material for insertion into the report)
- f) the report's response to Charge question 1 should be re-organized to address the charge question point-by point
- g) comments on the Pope study should provide more detail on the methodology of the re-analysis, and the provision of median and/or mean data points.

Following a summary of actions to be taken in revising these reports, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 2:30PM.

I certify that these minutes are accurate to the best of my knowledge.

Dr. Maureen Cropper
Chair

Mr. Samuel Rondberg
Designated Federal Officer

Ms. Angela Nugent
Designated Federal Officer

Attachments